

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE STUDENTS OF

---

THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

---

J.A. Hamilton

STORAGE-ITEM  
MAIN LIBRARY

LPA-808C  
U.B.C. LIBRARY

V 415  
F5 H2  
1864

THE LIBRARY



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
BRITISH COLUMBIA

# AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

STUDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

AT NEWPORT, JUNE, 1864.

BY JAMES A. HAMILTON.

BOSTON:  
TICKNOR AND FIELDS.

1864.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1864, by  
TICKNOR AND FIELDS,  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

RIVERSIDE, CAMBRIDGE:  
PRINTED BY H. O. HOUGHTON AND COMPANY.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

U. S. NAVAL ACADEMY, }  
Newport, June 8th, 1864. }

SIR, — We respectfully request a copy of your Address for publication.

We think that an event such as an Address from the son of a statesman second only to Washington in the history of our country, should be preserved in the records of the Academy, and transmitted in some tangible form to the classes hereafter entering the Institution.

Very respectfully,

G. V. MENZIES, T. F. JEWELL,  
*Committee from the 1st Class.*

F. M. BARBER, S. HUBBARD,  
*Committee from the 2d Class.*

M. S. DAY, F. TURNBULL,  
*Committee from 2d Div. of 2d Class.*

T. C. ANDERSON, E. N. ROTH,  
*Committee from the 3d Class.*

E. C. SMITH, H. H. DAVIS,  
*Committee from 2d Div. of 3d Class.*

ALFRED CRAVEN, E. A. BENJAMIN,  
*Committee from the 4th Class.*

To James A. Hamilton, Esq.

---

Newport, June 9th, 1864.

To Messrs. G. V. Menzies and others, Committees representing the Classes  
of Midshipmen at the Naval Academy :

YOUNG GENTLEMEN, — Your very kind letter of the 8th instant, requesting a copy of my Address for publication, is received. If my health will permit, I will send the Address I made to you, as nearly as my recollection of what I said will enable me to do so.

Receive my thanks for your tribute to the character of my father, Alexander Hamilton. It affords me pleasure to express my high appreciation of the Officers, Professors, and Assistant Professors of the Academy; your proficiency in the various branches of your studies, and other duties, affords the highest tribute to their meritorious services.

With my best wishes for your continued health and happiness, and that you may do honor to that arm of the service to which you belong, I pray you to remember me as

Your friend and servant,

JAMES A. HAMILTON.

## ADDRESS.

---

AFTER making a few pertinent and patriotic remarks, Commodore John Marston, President of the Board of Visitors, called upon James A. Hamilton, one of the Visitors, to address the students. He extemporized an Address substantially as follows :—

Young Gentlemen,—Unprepared as I am, I will endeavor, in compliance with the request of the gallant Commodore, to offer some considerations touching your personal and public characters and conduct, and particularly the interesting Constitutional questions drawn into discussion by the wicked rebellion which now threatens the National life.

You are all by birth citizens of the United States, and inhabitants of various States of this glorious, and, I trust, imperishable Union. By your admission to the Naval Academy, you are *the adopted sons of the Republic*, and these distinguished officers and professors, who so wisely, so learnedly, and so sedulously direct your education, as the agents of the Government, stand in the place of parents to you. After your duty to your Maker, your first and highest duty is to your Government and Country. This results not only from that allegiance which all who are born within the realm owe to their Government,

but from the fact that you are taken from the ordinary pursuits of life, and educated in the highest manner, to be the guardians of the honor of your country, and the interests of your fellow-citizens. Your field of service is the oceans and seas, comprising five eighths of the area of the world. This vast highway of nations has a *system of police* peculiar to itself, called "The Maritime Law of Nations," of which the ships of war of recognized nations are the police officers.

I am reminded by this august assemblage, the occasion, and this day, that I am following the footsteps of one of the most distinguished statesman of our nation, — who addressed you a year ago ; his devotion to the Republic, in this the hour of its utmost need, cannot be surpassed, — the Hon. Edward Everett. This recollection admonishes me of my incapacity, and almost compels me to withdraw from attempting to perform this duty. However, trusting to that indulgence which is due to my advanced age, I proceed.

Our considerations may properly assume two principal divisions. First, your personal and your public conduct and responsibilities ; and, second, the motives and rules which are to govern you in both.

*First.* Your private characters, and conduct, embracing your physical and moral condition. The former implies regard for your health and strength, to perform the arduous duties and to endure the privations to which you are necessarily to be exposed.

Cleanliness essentially contributes to health. The fastidious order of a man-of-war may be said to com-

pel its officers to be neat in their persons and dress. The gratification of such appetites as are inconsistent with health are to be sedulously avoided. The use of tobacco in every form, and of all intoxicating liquors, is not only a violation of the discipline of the Academy, but by all the rules of Hygiene is forbidden. By the use of tobacco in smoking, the glands of the throat are exposed to the action of that which ranks in intensity as the third of vegetable poisons. It tends directly to induce paralysis of the parts it reaches. The excessive indulgence in the use of intoxicating liquors inevitably reduces man to the level of the brute. Young as you are, you must have remarked the desolation it produces in families, and the number of men, with hopes as high and prospects as bright as yours are, who have been the victims of this disgusting vice.

Seeking for the origin of this inexorable habit, than which there is no other so difficult to be eradicated, or even modified, it will be found to proceed step by step,—first a little social jollification, next a mint-julep, a morning dram, and at last the secret indulgence of an appetite which has become a chronic disease. I beg you to believe that the first step you take in this progress to the lowest degradation and most shocking death, is the last you will honestly take in your honorable career, and that good habits are as readily acquired as bad ones by the exercise merely of a little self-control. Can there be a more egregious folly than to gratify our appetites of eating and drinking at the risk of our health, happiness, and future welfare?

Your highest ambition, of a personal and social character, should induce you to endeavor to establish the characters of *Christian gentlemen*. One of the distinguished men of the Republic — Gouverneur Morris, who rendered his country valuable services in various high public trusts — was asked to give the character of a gentleman. He referred the inquirer to the 15th Psalm.<sup>1</sup>

As to your moral character. Truth, my young friends, is the foundation, the solid and enduring foundation of all the virtues. One of the wisest of men says: "The knowledge of truth, which is the presence of it, and the belief of truth, which is the enjoying it, is the sovereign good of human nature." Men oftentimes lose the sense of this virtue at first by the habit of exaggerating in the relation of what they have seen or heard, — at first from a desire to interest and please by exciting an emotion. Thence they advance to exaggerate what they have suffered or accomplished, to gratify their own vanity. At times, by envy, hatred, or malice, to exaggerate the faults or failings of others; and thus advancing, step by step, from exaggeration to fabrication, they lose

<sup>1</sup> "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill?

He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart.

He that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor.

In whose eyes a vile person is contemned: but he honoreth them that fear the Lord. He that sweareth to his own hurt, and changeth not.

He that putteth not out his money to usury, nor taketh reward against the innocent. He that doeth these things shall never be moved."

that just sense of right and wrong which should be the inspiration of all we say and do.

*Self-Denial* is a primary virtue. It may, indeed, be said to be the only security against most of the evils incident to our unregulated nature. Locke says: "He that has not a mastery over his inclinations,—he that knows not how to resist the importunities of present pleasure or pain, for the sake of what reason tells him is not fit to be done,—wants the true principle of virtue and industry, and is in danger of never being good for anything."

As to your general demeanor. The courtesies of refined society result from a mutual disposition to sacrifice our convenience, ease, and pleasure, to promote those of others; consequently, when unselfishness controls the conduct generally of those in social intercourse, each person receives, by the courtesy of others, a return for the sacrifices he makes to them. This spirit, which controls the intercourse of good society, proceeds from all-pervading selfishness wisely controlled. Let the same spirit govern your intercourse with each other, and you will be prepared by habit to appear as courteous gentlemen in that intercourse with men of the world, to which, when in the highest rank of your profession, you will necessarily be called. "*Inest sua gratia parvis.*"

One more, and a most interesting subject, pertinent to your position as members of the Naval Academy, and particularly to your high and honorable association, as officers of the American Navy, challenges remark; I refer to OBEEDIENCE. Appropriate rules for your government, as members of this Academy, have

been formed with much care, and established by the highest authority. You know what they are. I do not intend to refer to the details, but to enforce upon your attention the great truth, that your conduct is to be governed by these rules, not because disobedience is followed by demerit, but from the high feeling of personal and academic honor. He who is induced to submit to the restraints of discipline alone by the fear of punishment, is unworthy of his position and of the society of his associates. You must all know and feel that the success of this Academy, in forming characters fit to be American Naval Officers, can only be carried out by that high and honorable tone which submits to restraints as a necessary and welcome duty. Let it be generally understood among you that all those who by cunning devices seek to violate the rules, are false to the true principles which should govern and bind you together.

It is, I fear, by some supposed to be an evidence of cleverness to be enabled to violate the regulations so cunningly as to avoid detection ; and indeed there may be those who boast of such achievements, although to do so necessarily implies dishonor. Let the common sense of the corps advance to that point which estimates strict obedience a high and necessary duty, and those delinquents, if there be such, will be scorned. It has been well said, "That there is no vice that doth so cover a man with shame as to be found to be false and perfidious."

Your conduct and character as officers of the Navy is a subject of vast importance and intense interest.

The gallant achievements of the American Navy, in the past and the present, awaken feelings of pride and a consciousness of power which should induce all who now live under the Stars and Stripes exultingly to say, "This is my own, my native land"; and proudly to claim its illustrious history as a part of their inheritance, and to be ready at all times and at any sacrifice to sustain it as the emblem of our great and undivided Republic.

The highest duty of an officer of the Navy is *prompt and unhesitating obedience*. Upon this, on his and the part of all others, depends not only success in battle, but the safety of the vessel in which they are embarked. The power of the commander of every vessel to compel absolute obedience by all on board, is only limited by the necessity of the occasion, of which he is the sole judge at the time.

The next duty of the officer is to take care of all who are subordinate to him, and particularly of those *before the mast*. And here let me remark, that seamen are proverbially heedless and improvident, so much so, indeed, as that they are, in judgment of law, considered as incapable of taking care of themselves, as is shown by the fact that a sailor cannot make a contract to dispose of his wages or prize-money unless it is sanctioned by his commanding officer.

To extend to men in their situation all the guardianship which their peculiar condition and characters require, is not only a duty of humanity, but it is induced by those feelings which always move an honorable man to protect and defend the feeble and

dependent. These men are too often exposed to harshness, and sometimes to oppression, by the indulgence of a hasty temper.

No man ought ever to be subjected to punishment by an officer, while the latter is in anger, or without affording the offender time and opportunity to explain or palliate his conduct, except in the case of a *mutiny*, which requires the exercise of immediate and the most effectual measures of suppression, even unto death. Kindness, forbearance, and a wise moderation, not only command respect, but induce regard for officers, and prompt obedience in emergencies.

I beg permission, before I close, to present some views for your consideration in regard to the Government of our country, which will, I trust, be interesting and useful to you.

Our first Government was that which resulted as a necessity from the Declaration of Independence passed by Congress, and sanctioned by the people of the States through their respective legislatures. This *first Federal act*, which made the inhabitants of the several Colonies *one people*, and by which they, as a united people, assumed the position of a *State* among the States of the world, impliedly authorized the Congress to exercise all those powers which were required to carry on the war then waged by Great Britain. It was a Government of absolute powers, limited only by the necessities of the situation. It commenced on the 4th of July, 1776, and continued until March, 1781, when the *second* Government—formed by the Articles of Confederation—was adopted by Maryland, the last of all the States to adopt it.

This Government continued until April, 1789, when the Government of the United States, under the existing Constitution, having been adopted by the people of the United States, was inaugurated.

It is, at this time, of vast importance to all, that just and precise opinions should be entertained in regard to the existing Constitution of Government, and the true and radical difference between it and that Government which was abolished when it was established,—I mean the Confederacy of sovereign and independent States. And now let me invite your earnest attention to these important truths.

The Articles of the Confederation were formed by the delegates of the different States in Congress assembled; and were ratified, *not* by the people of any State, or the Nation, but by their legislatures; whereas the existing *Constitution of Government* was formed by a Convention of delegates from the several States, and adopted by the people of the United States, in order, among other things, as it declared, "*To secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.*" These words, "our posterity," are of great significance in this connection. If it had been formed by States, the words "*our successors*" would have been used. Natural bodies, as individuals, have *posterity*. Artificial bodies, *successors*. It was also ratified by the people of the Nation through conventions of delegates elected by the people of the several States; and thus, in the words of Alexander Hamilton, "*The fabric of American Empire rested upon the solid basis of the consent of the American people, the pure original fountain of all legitimate authority.*"

In order clearly to understand and truly to appreciate the essential difference between *the Articles of Confederation* and the existing Constitution of Government, we propose to submit to you the following truths :—

*First.* As to the formation of the *Confederacy*. It was a league between sovereign and independent States. Its representation was by delegates from each State. The States, great or small, had an equal representation by their delegates, and equal votes,—each State giving one vote.

A majority of States decided questions, except on the most important subjects, to wit: *War, Treaties, Coinage ; to raise the sums necessary for defence and welfare ; to borrow money ; to appropriate money ; to build and equip a Navy ; the number of land and sea forces, and to appoint a Commander-in-Chief.* These acts required the assent of *nine* States out of the thirteen. There was no Judiciary. The executive powers were exercised by the Congress. However, “the great and radical vice in the construction of the Confederacy was the principle of legislation for *States or Governments in their corporate or collective capacities*, and as contradistinguished from the individuals of whom they consist. This was the bane of that Government, and is entirely incompatible with the idea of a Government.”<sup>1</sup> “Experience is the oracle of Truth ; and when its responses are unequivocal, they ought to be conclusive and sacred.” The important truth unequivocally pronounced in the present case, is that “a sovereignty over sovereigns, a government over

<sup>1</sup> Hamilton.

governments, a legislation for communities as contradistinguished from individuals, as it is a solecism in theory, so in practice it is subversive of the order and ends of civil polity; by substituting violence in place of law, or the destructive coercion of the sword in place of the mild and salutary coercion of the magistracy." Such was the Government established by the Articles of Confederation,—a league between sovereign and independent States. (See Articles 2d and 3d.)

The following statement of facts will prove how completely it had run down, and that the country was only saved from anarchy by the establishment of a *National Government*.

The former Government had power only to make requisitions for men and money upon the sovereign States. During the war, the delinquency of the States was universal; and during the last five years of that Government, a period of peace, the States of South Carolina, North Carolina, and Georgia did *not* contribute one dollar to the National Treasury. New York alone contributed her full quota. In the year 1786 the interest on the public debt amounted to above four millions of dollars; this and the military and civil expenses were to be provided for, and in that year the paltry sum of *two hundred thousand dollars* was paid into the public treasury, and that by *one* State. The excuse for the statesman who adopted such an impracticable scheme of Government, was, that it was formed amid all the perils and anxieties of a desolating war. It certainly brought

the country, in less than seven years, during peace, "to a condition almost of anarchy."

Mr. Madison, speaking of the situation of the nation under the Confederation, says: "She finds she is held in no respect by her friends; that she is the derision of her enemies; and that she is a prey to every nation which has an interest in her fluctuating councils and embarrassed affairs."<sup>1</sup> "We may indeed, with propriety, be said to have reached the lowest stage of national humiliation," &c. Again, speaking of the *States' Rights Democrats*, who opposed the adoption of the now existing Constitution, he said: "They aim at sovereignty in the Union, and complete independence in the members; they cherish, with blind devotion, *the political monster of an Imperium in imperio.*"

Mr. Madison says: "The characteristic distinction between free governments and governments not free, is that the former are founded on compact, not between the Government and those for whom it acts, but among the parties creating the Government. Each of these being equal, neither can have more right to say that the compact has been violated than every other has to deny the fact, and to insist on the execution of the bargain." "An inference from the doctrine, that a single State has a right to secede at will from *the rest*, is that *the rest would have an equal right to secede from it; in other words, to turn it out.*" In the case of a State seceding from the Union, its domain would be dismembered.

<sup>1</sup> The Federalist, No. 15.

In the Convention of 1787 Mr. Patterson proposed "The Articles of Confederation with Amendments." This was known as "*The Jersey Plan*." Mr. King moved, "That the Committee rise and report that the JERSEY PLAN was inadmissible." This motion was carried by *seven* States against *three*, and thus the plan of a confederacy of sovereign and independent States was finally rejected. Mr. Madison, in debate, said: "It is impossible that the Articles of Confederation can be amended. They are too tottering to be invigorated; nothing but the present system, (the Virginia Plan,) or something like it, can restore the peace and harmony of the country." Luther Martin, a delegate from Maryland, who objected to the Virginia Plan, in his report to his legislature, January, 1788, said, "It is, in its very introduction, declared to be a compact of the people of the United States, as individuals, and is to be ratified by the *people at large* in their capacity of individuals." He insisted, as an objection to the Constitution, that the representatives, instead of being drawn from the people at large, as individuals, ought to be drawn from the States, as States, in their sovereign capacity; that the system of Government ought to be *ratified by the States, and not by the people*, as individuals.

The Government of the United States, the result of the earnest and patriotic labors of the most illustrious body of practical statesmen ever assembled for any political purpose, is perseveringly represented, not only by its enemies now in rebellion, but by leading partisans and influential men in pub-

lic stations who sympathize with treason, as "a mere compact between sovereign and independent States."

They dare to say, "The Government of the United States is the agent through whom the States communicate with foreign nations." "That the citizens of the various States owe their obedience to the Government of the United States, because their own State, as part of the Confederation, enjoins it." "Allegiance is a term applicable only to that submission which we owe to our own sovereign State." "The Government of the United States was created by the existing separate States." Jefferson Davis said, "*State sovereignty leads legitimately to secession ; and thus the right of a State to secede from the Union is an essential attribute of State sovereignty.*" Let the States' Rights party take the legitimate consequences of the dogmas they teach, and avow that they are secessionists.

To insist that the Convention of 1787 formed a Government which was a compact between independent State sovereignties, and that they thus re-adopted all the vices of that system which they expressly repudiated as impracticable, is not only to violate the truth of history, but to endeavor to delude the people by gross and palpable misrepresentations.

It will be recollected that the Preamble to the Articles of Confederation uses these words : "Articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the States of New Hampshire," &c. That by the second article it was declared, that "each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence." And by the 3d article it was declared, "The said States here-

by entering into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defence and general welfare."

Now mark the difference between this and the Constitution of the United States. By the Preamble to the latter it was declared: "We the People of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

It is worthy of note, in regard to this glorious Preamble, that as the Articles of Confederation had declared "the Union shall be perpetual," it was only necessary to make that which was decreed to be a "perpetual," a more "*perfect Union*," by destroying those powers in the respective State governments which could endanger the Union, and above all, by changing their character of sovereign and independent States. "*Sovereignty is the supreme ultimate authority in a country.*" In our country such authority is in the people of the United States. When they formed the existing Constitution of Government, they conferred that supreme ultimate authority upon the National Government; making the State governments constituent parts of the Government; leaving with them those residuary authorities required to be exercised for local purposes.

When the people of the several States, by their delegates in Convention, ratified and adopted the National Constitution, they, by that act, necessarily

eliminated from their respective State constitutions all such powers as were inconsistent with or repugnant to the powers conferred by them on the Government of the United States by that Constitution. This was thus as effectually done as if they had declared *seriatim* that such and such powers, before conferred by them on their State governments, should no longer exist. For instance, theretofore, the State constitutions and laws were the supreme authority over the people within the limits of the respective States; but when, by the adoption of the National Constitution, the people declared, as they did in the most emphatic manner, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof," &c., "*shall be the supreme law of the land* ; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding ;" they necessarily decreed that their State governments no longer possess "the supreme ultimate authority" over the people of such States ; and thus the people deprived the State governments of that sovereign and independent character they had before possessed and exercised.

In this view of the subject, which is believed to be *invincible*, can the mischievous dogma be sustained, "That the States are sovereign and independent powers" ? and particularly when the source of all power — the people of the United States in their sovereign capacity — have declared, that the people of the States shall be governed by the Constitution and laws of another government ? *Supreme, is sov-*

*ereign power.* The sovereign power to make all laws, pursuant to the National Constitution, — the rule of action of the people of the States, — deprived the State governments of sovereign power over all those subjects which were committed to the United States Government.

It may be asserted, without the fear of contradiction, that these subjects embrace *all the essential attributes of sovereignty*. What are they?

Article 1, section 8, declares — “The Congress shall have power

“To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises; to pay the debts, and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States.

“To borrow money on the credit of the United States.

“To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

“To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States.

“To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

“To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States.

“To establish post-offices and post-roads.

“To promote the progress of science and useful arts, &c.

“To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court; to define and punish piracies and felonies

committed on the high seas, and offences against the laws of nations.

“To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

“To raise and support armies, &c.

“To provide and maintain a navy.

“To make rules for the government of the land and naval forces.

“To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion.

“To provide for organizing the armies and disciplining the militia, &c.

“To exercise exclusive legislation, in all cases whatever, over such district, &c., the seat of government of the United States, and over forts, &c.

“To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.”

These are, with one exception, (the collection of taxes,) exclusive powers. The power given to Congress, *to make all laws necessary and proper* (which the Supreme Court of the United States has decided to mean “appropriate”) *for carrying into execution the foregoing powers*, is of vast significance, and particularly in connection with the following powers, — “Congress shall have power to *provide* for the common defence and *general welfare of the United States*.” The authors of this Constitution being statesmen, that is, “men

having a general and accurate acquaintance with the affairs of state, and habits of thinking seldom acquired but from a familiarity with public concerns," looking into the future of this great Commonwealth, took care to secure to the National Legislature full power to pass all laws which were, in its discretion, necessary and proper (appropriate) to provide for the common defence and general welfare. These were not only powers delegated by the people of the United States to their National Government, but, in the language of Mr. J. Q. Adams, "*they are not only grants of power, but trusts to be executed, duties to be discharged, for the common defence and general welfare.*"

It is difficult to understand how intelligent and fair men can say, "The States are *sovereign and independent*," when the people, who gave to the State governments all the powers they possess, withdrew from them all these great attributes of sovereignty and delegated them to another government.

A further examination of the powers expressly denied to the States, will conclusively prove that they are not sovereign but subordinate governments.

First. It is declared that "*no State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation.*" That "no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State." That "no State shall, *without the consent of Congress*, lay any imposts or duties on imports or exports except what may be absolutely necessary for executing its inspection laws, and the net proceeds of such duties *shall be for the use of the Treasury of the United States.*" "And all such laws shall be subject to the revision and control of the Congress."

Is it possible that any intelligent and upright man, in the face of these inhibitions, can represent the States as *sovereign and independent*? If “sovereignty is supreme power,” as it is asserted to be by all writers on government, surely this inhibition proves that the States *are dependent on the National Government*, and are, therefore, neither supreme or independent. We find another prohibitory clause more decisive than even this: “*No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with any other State, or with a foreign power.*”

In connection with this stern inhibition, this absolute denial of the sovereignty or independence of the States, we refer to this clause as one of the means provided by the Constitution “*to form a more perfect Union.*”

Is it not simply absurd, as well as a gross attempt to delude the uninformed, to say that a State which is deprived of the power of keeping troops or ships of war, or of entering into any agreement or compact with another of her sister States, or with a foreign power, can, by any perversion of language, be said to be a sovereign and independent State?

These inhibitions not only prove that the States are not sovereign and independent, but they prove that the Constitution of the United States was intended to deprive the States of these powers, and that strength which would be derived from an army, and a domestic or a foreign compact, in the event

of a conflict between the National Government and the people of a State in insurrection.

From this clause the right of coercion by the sword is fairly to be inferred. The history of our country proves that General Washington asserted the right, and enforced, by an army of twelve thousand men, the power "*to reduce the refractory into obedience to the laws,*" when, in 1793, the people of a part of Pennsylvania and Virginia rose in insurrection against the National Government. He thus took the most summary and effectual means to "ensure domestic tranquillity." Mr. Jefferson expressed the opinion, that, under the Government established by the Articles of Confederation, the Congress had the right to compel a State, by force of arms, to perform its Federal duties.

In closing this, the most important part of my duty, I ask your earnest attention to those parts of the Constitution which give Congress the power "to establish an uniform rule of naturalization," coupled with the power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations," and with the declaration, that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

Under these powers, *which are exclusive*, Congress has full and absolute power to carry into any State the peoples of all countries in the world, without distinction of color or race; and being within the limits of any State, by the power of naturalization, to make them citizens of the United States, and of the State

into which they are imported ; and thus being made citizens of one State, they are, by the Constitution of the United States, entitled "to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States."

Is it possible to aver, without offending the common sense of mankind, that a political community or State, deprived of the power to say what persons shall be her citizens, and that persons made citizens by the laws of another government shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of the native citizens of the State, *can be*, or pretend to be, a sovereign and independent State ?

The Constitution of the United States, art. 4, sec. 3, declares, that "*New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union.*"

It is insisted that the States being sovereign and independent powers, are united by a league or compact ; and yet, by this provision, it is certain that another government has the power to admit new parties to that league. The advocate of State sovereignty insists that the old thirteen States, by their sovereign will, formed that compact of union. And yet it is clear that they have no power to consent to or forbid any foreign power (as in the case of Texas) from being admitted a party to that league.

Again : these so-called sovereign and independent States are, by the powers delegated to the Government of the United States, forbidden to alter their constitutions *as they please*. Art. 4, sec. 4, declares, "*The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of government.*" Should the

people of any State desire to alter their constitution so as to establish an aristocratical or monarchical government, they have authorized another government to destroy such new government, and to establish, by force of arms if necessary, a Republican form of government in such State.

The Constitution of the United States declares, Article 6, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land." In the face of this emphatic declaration, that the Constitution and laws of the United States shall be supreme, can folly or mendacity go so far as to assert, that any other constitution, or law, or government of the land can be sovereign, or that the States can be independent?

I submit these questions, with entire confidence, to your intelligence; and desire to express the hope that you, as citizens or officers, will hold THE UNION of the States, under the Constitution of the United States, to be the object of *your sacred and devoted loyalty*.

In taking leave of you, my young friends, as I may be said to do forever, let me ask you not to forget or disregard that religious training you received from your devoted mothers in your childhood. It has been truly said, and worthy of your remembrance during the vicissitudes of your ceaseless occupation, that "No man can hinder our private addresses to God; every man can build a chapel in his breast,—himself the priest, his heart the sacrifice,

and the earth or deck he treads upon the altar ;” and, as was truly said by one of our most eminent Christian teachers, “One ray of moral and religious truth is worth all the wisdom of the schools ; one lesson from Christ will carry you higher than years of study.”





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

SEP 25 1978

DISCARD

